

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants are canceling claims 3, 5 and 6 and non-elected claims 12-55 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional or continuation applications directed to the canceled subject matter. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 have been amended. No new claims have been added. As a result, claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11 are pending for examination with claim 1 being the only independent claim. No new matter has been added.

Drawings

The Office Action indicates that new corrected drawings are required in this application because the reference numbers are handwritten. Further, the Office Action states that corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Applicants recognize the requirement of the submission of formal drawings within three months from the mail date of a notice of allowability. See 37 CFR 1.85(c). During a telephone discussion with Shannon Pratt on March 24, 2004, Examiner Hyeon clarified that formal drawings are not required with the response to this Office Action. Applicants will submit formal drawings in this application after receipt of a Notice of Allowability.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's finding that claims 6 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of allowable claim 6 and the intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 3, 5, and 6 have been canceled, since these claims are now incorporated into amended claim 1. Claims 4, 7, and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. The Office Action alleges that the omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the registration feature

and its corresponding feature. In particular, the Office Action states that claim 11 does not recite the location of the corresponding feature, such that it is not clear what is the predetermined location. The Office Action further contends that it is not clear what structure includes the corresponding feature.

Without acceding to the propriety of the Examiner's positions, Applicants have amended claim 11 in a manner believed to address the Examiner's concerns so as to advance prosecution of this application. More particularly, applicants have amended claim 11 to recite a registration feature that is adapted to mate with a corresponding feature *provided on one or more manufacturing tools or stations* to position the receptacle in a predetermined location *relative to the one or more manufacturing tools or stations* to receive the coiled fiber in the receptacle. Support for this clarifying amendment is found in the specification on page 4.

In view of the foregoing, the rejections under §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102/103

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Reitmeier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,938). Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reitmeier et al. in view of Orlando (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,469), and claim 11 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Reitmeier et al. and Orlando in view of Daoud et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,866).

Without acceding to the propriety of the Examiner's positions, Applicants have canceled or amended certain of these claims to expedite prosecution and place this application in condition for allowance. As indicated above, claim 1 has been rewritten to incorporate all the limitations of allowable claim 6, such that claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2, 4 an 8-11 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,



Shannon M. Pratt, Reg. No.: 55,548
James M. Hanifin, Jr., Reg. No.: 39,213
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Date: March 29, 2004
x03/31/04